Appeal: 12-6792 Doc: 5 Filed: 06/20/2012 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6792

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

WILBUR EDDIS CLINE,

Defendant - Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:04-cr-01066-HMH-4; 6:12-cv-00884-HMH; 6:11-cv-03378-HMH; 6:07-cv-70079-HFF)

Submitted: June 14, 2012 Decided: June 20, 2012

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Wilbur Eddis Cline, Appellant Pro Se. Alan Lance Crick, Assistant United States Attorney, Greenville, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Eddis Cline seeks to appeal the district court's order construing his motion for a sentence reduction as a successive 28 U.S.C.A. § 2255 (West Supp. 2011) motion and dismissing it on that basis. The order is not appealable unless justice or judge issues circuit a certificate appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2006). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating jurists would find that the reasonable district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Cline has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal Appeal: 12-6792 Doc: 5 Filed: 06/20/2012 Pg: 3 of 3

contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED